



Tracing the Image of Turks in Travel Writing through Translation

Seda TAŞ İLMEK¹ 



¹Assoc. Prof., Trakya University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Translation and Interpreting, Edirne, Türkiye

ORCID: S.T.I. 0000-00023819-7254

Corresponding author:

Seda TAŞ İLMEK,
Trakya University, Faculty of Letters,
Department of Translation and Interpreting,
Edirne, Türkiye
E-mail: sedatas@trakya.edu.tr

Submitted: 23.12.2021

Revision Requested: 19.01.2022

Last Revision Received: 25.02.2022

Accepted: 23.05.2022

Citation: Tas Ilmek, S. (2022). Tracing the image of Turks in travel writing through translation. *Litera*, 32(2), 813-832.
<https://doi.org/10.26650/LITERA2021-1040310>

ABSTRACT

The main aim of this study is to examine how the images of Turks were depicted in the travel writing *A Journey through the Crimea to Constantinople*, written by the English traveler Elizabeth Craven, and to trace their repatriation into Turkish through translation entitled *1786'da Türkiye (Turkey in 1786)* by the translator Reşat Ekrem Koçu. This study benefits from an imagological perspective in its methodology and applies a comparative textual analysis, which puts a particular emphasis on the abundance of negative images of Turks in the source text and reflects the scarcity of such images in the target text. The analysis, from an imagological lens, shows that the hetero-images of Turks, which were mostly constructed through negative implications by the foreign writer, were lost in their repatriation to their own culture. In other words, the negative images of Turks were largely omitted from the target text, and the source text was abridged to a large extent by the Turkish translator, revealing the fact that the Other's negative views about the Turks could not cross the borders at all. This, naturally, leads the text with a pejorative tone towards the Turks to be rewritten as a target text having a commendatory tone due to the presence of a plethora of positive Turkish imagery along with the paratextual additions such as several illustrations, comments, the translator's preface, and the publisher's note. Therefore, the analysis suggests that the translator, as an intercultural agent, seemed to claim his position as an author-translator in the translation process while particularly illustrating the function of gatekeeping and the use of translation for selecting and highlighting the representation of mental pictures of a certain culture and period.

Keywords: Images, Turks, travel writing, repatriation, translation



Introduction

The English traveler Elizabeth Craven's *A Journey through the Crimea to Constantinople* was published in 1789 as a collection of her letters sent in the course of her journey embodying her travels to the Orient and Europe. The translation of this source text was published in 1939 with the title of *1786'da Türkiye (Turkey in 1786)*. The translator Reşat Ekrem Koçu employed a selective approach and only translated the letters mentioning Craven's travels on the Ottoman territories. A previous study applying comparative paratextual and textual analysis of these texts focused on the identity of the translator as an author-translator and highlighted the reflections of this identity on the rewritten/translated text (Taş, 2019). However, the present study tries to trace the images of Turks through translation by providing a more detailed textual analysis from an imagological lens, which the previous study lacks. From a diaristic perspective, travel writing is often interwoven with a plethora of images as the travelers describe the people and the places they encounter. Therefore, this study benefits from the nexus between translation studies and imagology, which is defined as the study of national and cultural images.

In this study, first the source text as a travel writing will be scrutinized and then information about the historical and political background of the translation, together with the translation and its agents, will be provided. Second, in the methodological remarks, imagological insights will be shared and later a textual analysis from the imagological lens will be conducted. Finally, in the concluding remarks, discussions, and conclusions will be presented.

The Source Text as a Travel Writing

Travel writing, also well-known as "travel literature", "travelogue" or "travel book", includes a wide range of texts such as diaries, journals, letters, memories, autobiographies, and adventure notes whose primary focus is to narrate "travel". As a woman travel writer, Elizabeth Craven visited many places in Europe and the Middle East in the 18th century, and during her trips she sent travel letters to Charles-Alexander Margrave of Brandenburg-Anspach-Bayreuth. The journey she began in the spring of 1785 lasted 18 months. The English writer traveled to varied and remote places such as France, Russia, Italy, Greece, Bulgaria, Turkey (the Ottoman Empire) and returned to England. Traveling and experiencing such a long journey was the exclusive privilege of men and uncommon for a lady like Craven. Thus, her decision to travel abroad seems to be brave and

purposeful. Although there could have been many reasons for this journey, it has mostly been claimed that her unfaithfulness to her husband, Baron William Craven, and the disturbance created by its rumors caused her to take the opportunity to escape from social pressure in England.

In the course of her journey, Craven wrote 68 letters to the Margrave of Brandenburg, with whom she had had a love affair, and eventually married after the journey. She did not hint at this relationship directly in her travel letters. As Alison Winch (2019) writes, “Craven seeks to preserve her reputation throughout by addressing the margrave as her brother and friend while simultaneously performing herself as a desirable lover and potential wife” (p. 91). She published these letters as a book with the title of *A Journey through the Crimea to Constantinople* in 1789. From this aspect, she follows the footsteps of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, who had traveled in Europe and lived in the Ottoman Empire because of her husband’s diplomatic position. Montagu wrote travel letters for the first time as a woman traveler and later published her letters as a book entitled *Turkish Embassy Letters* in 1763. However, it is important to note that Craven was a British woman traveler who traveled alone. As Efterpi Mitsi (2008) underlines, “Elizabeth Craven’s account represents the exploits of an aristocratic and ambitious Englishwoman, traveling alone in regions where no other European woman had ever traveled before” (p. 21).

In her letters, Craven mentions the picturesque depictions of landscapes, the architecture or the towns she saw, or the people she encountered in various countries. For instance, she describes Bursa as a beautiful valley between cities. In her words:

A very pleasant passage from Smyrna to Moudagna—just as the Tarleton arrived at the entrance of the Straits, wind dropped entirely and we found ourselves amid a large fleet, composed of vessels of every size and nation, that waited for a South wind to pass the Dardanel—luckily, we did not lay a considerable time at anchor, a southerly breeze sprung up and our swift Tarleton left all the other sails. (Craven, 1789, p. 273)

In her view, the Ottoman territory is spectacularly impressive, and she writes, “This beautiful, enchanting country, the climate, the objects, the situation of it, make it an earthly Paradise (Craven, 1789, p. 284). She describes the Mosque of St. Sophia, harem, streets, the Sultan, men and women, people’s clothes, and manners. She frequently

writes about her astonishment about the places she visited in the Eastern world. However, prejudices and scorn are also felt in her narrative through representations of the Turks. Her negative imagery of Turks in a way reveals her Orientalist perspective as a British traveler towards the Turks, because she mostly mentions Turks in a manner of disdain and discontent. It is therefore easy to trace her pejorative tone in descriptions of Turks in phrases such as “Mahometan ignorance” (Craven, 1789, p. 290), “the indolent Turk” (Craven, 1789, p. 249), “Turks are idle and ignorant” (Craven, 1789, p. 272), “the negligence of the Turks” (Craven, 1789, p. 289), “Turkish ignorance” (Craven, 1789, p. 344), “Turkish idleness” (Craven, 1789, p. 412), “Turkish supineness”, and “Asiatic splendour, superstition, and laziness” (Craven, 1789, p. 413). It appears that Craven mostly adheres to orientalist clichés while depicting the Turks and the country which is “the Orient” in her perception. Moreover, after she discloses her orientalist views towards the locals in the Ottoman Empire throughout the letters, she concludes that “(...) the Turks should be confined to their Asiatic shore, and all European Turkey should belong to the Christians” (p. 413). Particularly, when she leaves the Ottoman territories and returns to Europe, she feels safe again as she writes in her letter that “I cannot tell you, Sir, how glad I was to see the eagle upon a post, and feel myself under the Imperial protection” (p. 404). Also, being in the East makes her feel insecure because she finds no favor in the locals who were Muslims and the “Other” to her. Therefore, she is relieved back in Europe among the Christian community where she belongs, as she expresses in her last letter that she feels happy to be “among Christian like people” (p. 406).

Craven’s journey to the Orient as an English aristocrat primarily represents her desire to see the place of wonders in the East for which the West was always interested in, besides the fact that she had some other personal reasons, like escaping from social stigma in the West and making a fresh start after the journey. Although the Ottoman Empire was in decline after its splendid years in the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries, its territories continued to be spectacular for Western travelers such as George Gordon Byron, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, and Elizabeth Craven due to its geographical position and the representation of its identity as an exotic Eastern and Muslim country. Western travel writers often visited the Ottoman Empire and observed its cultural, social, political, architectural, economic, and military qualities. While writing their experiences and observations in their travel writings, they mostly tend to conceptualize an Eastern image reflecting fantasy and fear. As Luc van Doorslaer (2019) argues, “Oriental peoples and cultures were sometimes valorized as cruel, expansionist or despotic, but just as well as mysteriously attractive, inventive or mythical”

(p. 63). In other words, they not only provide information about the East that the West wondered about but also contribute to the construction of stereotyping a general and well-known Eastern identity for the Ottomans as violent, oriental, or the "Other". From this perspective, it is noteworthy to emphasize that travel writings were not without prejudiced views, as can be seen in the construction of Eastern and Islamic stereotypes in Craven's travel writing.

Before tracing the constructed images of Turks in Craven's narration and examining how these images were repatriated into Turkish through translation, it is important to highlight the historical and political background of the translation. Furthermore, the translator Reşat Ekrem Koçu deserves special mention not simply for being the translator of the text but also for being a historian and prolific writer, which eventually shows the translator's position or role as a Turkish translator-author and gatekeeper.

The historical and political background of the translation

The translator and the historian Koçu translated English travel writer Craven's book *A Journey through the Crimea to Constantinople* (1789) into Turkish in 1939 with the title of *1786'da Türkiye (Turkey in 1786)*. Koçu's translation coincided with a tumultuous time in Turkish history and his translation decisions, which resulted in a target text of 44 pages in Turkish from a source of 327 pages in total, require special attention. As Susan Basnett and André Lefevere (1998) claim, "a writer does not just write in a vacuum: he or she is the product of a particular culture, of a particular moment in time" (p. 136). One could regard the translator Koçu and his translation as the product of a nation-building era in which Turkey tried to sever all its ties with Oriental imagery and aimed to create a modern and Western image for the newly established nation. Understanding such significant factors lying at the background of a translation "enables readers to understand not just how the translator chooses to translate but also perhaps more importantly, why he or she chooses to translate in a certain manner" (Basnett & Lefevere, 1998, p.137). Therefore, it is beneficial to consider the historical and political backgrounds of the translations. In this context, translation scholar Gideon Toury (1995) asserts that "no translation should ever be studied outside of the context in which it came into being" (p. 22). He puts forward the concept of norms to examine translations in their historical contexts and his translation norms involve preliminary, operational, and initial norms. While preliminary norms include translation policy and directness of translation, for Toury (1995) these norms govern the choice of texts and text-types, the choice of

language for translation, and also human agents and groups such as the publishers, editors, and translators. Therefore, this part firstly focuses on the historical and political background of Koçu's translation, and later examines the choice of the text for translation and the choice for importing the text into Turkish in the 1930s within the context of translation policy.

The Republic of Turkey was founded in 1923, rising from the remnants of the Ottoman Empire which was dismantled following the First World War. Soon after the proclamation of the Turkish Republic by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the republican regime put into effect some western-oriented reforms to secularize and westernize Turkey. In fact, the Ottoman Empire, which represented the Orient for the West, had gone through a period of western-inspired reforms by the end of the 19th century and the early 20th century. The purpose was to imitate the West by renewing itself in the fields of military, education, bureaucracy, and law. Despite this climate of progress and change, the Ottoman Empire, which had gained a negative image because of its ties with the Islamic and Eastern world for centuries, continued to "inspire strong national enmity" and be "the strongest Other" for the European countries: "Islamic, alien, cruel and tyrannical" (Kuran-Burçoğlu, 2007, p. 255). Thus, in the action program of the young republic, the priority was to create a new Turkish identity that was not built upon the Islamic religion and such Oriental imagery as it had been under the rule of the Ottoman Empire.

As one of the most competent scholars on Orientalism, Edward Said (1978) defines Orientalism as "a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient" (p. 3). For him, such a stereotypical representation of Turks as exotic Easterners or barbaric Orientals is a construction of the West in line with its ideologies, which is later embraced unconsciously by the Easterner or the Oriental. Laura Laurušaitė (2018) claims that "in the model of Orientalism, imagining functions as a power tool for subordinating the Orient by attributing preconceived pejorative meanings to it, and by emphasizing the patronising relation of the West with regards to the East" (p.11). Aware of this historical and mental perspective, the young republic incorporated several secular reforms into its extensive program to ensure western integration of the newly founded Turkey and break the perception of Turkey as "the Other" or the "Orient" under the leadership of Atatürk. The reforms such as the establishment of a unitary education system (1924), adoption of Western timing and the Western calendar (1925), adoption of the international numeric system (1928), and the alphabet reform (1928) had the intent of emulating European systems. As Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar (2008) asserts, "the

reforms realised in the first fifteen years of the republic all had a crucial role in creating and maintaining the new Turkish identity which was based on a new repertoire composed of a largely western inventory" (p. 51). Moreover, as language and history played an important role in creating identity and a sense of nationhood, the Turkish Historical Society was established in 1931, by Atatürk's initiative, and then the Turkish Linguistic Society was established in 1932. These institutions worked on moving away from the Orientalist perspective in language and history of the newly formed nation by pushing the Ottoman imagery to the background with studies emphasizing Turkishness, because sharing a common language and past was an important aspect in the process of nation-building and modernization. For instance, the first historical text publications of the Turkish Historical Society had the purpose of claiming that the Turks had been carrying the identity of Turkishness for many centuries. As Tahir Gürçağlar (2008) asserts, "the main task of the Society was to carry out research into Turkish history and to prove that this history was not confined to the Ottoman past" (p. 57).

All the reforms and the establishment of various institutions in the early years of the republic regime endeavored to create an independent Turkish nation with a unique Turkish identity rather than an identity based on Islamic roots or Ottoman imagery, which had been regarded as the Orient by the West for many centuries. Özlem Berk (2006) writes that "the new identity that the young Republic wanted to create for its people can be summarised as a modern, Europe-oriented and secular society whose members would feel themselves to be primarily Turks" (p. 6). Therefore, translating historical texts such as travel writings and history novels focusing on Ottoman history or Turkish history was approved in this tumultuous time, as the young republic was in favor of creating a common past for the newly founded nation. As Toury (1995) maintains that "cultures resort to translating precisely as a way of filling in gaps, whenever and wherever such gaps may manifest themselves" (p. 21). Thus, translation became instrumental in both enlightening the Turkish people about history and also creating a sense of nationhood that was in harmony with the young republic's cultural and political agenda.

The translation and Its Agents

When it comes to the translation and its agents, it is necessary first to provide information about the publisher and the translator involved in the translation. The publisher of the text is Çığır Publishing House (Çığır Kitabevi) which contributed to Turkey's cultural and literary life in the 1930s and 1940s with a wide range of publications

formed from the literary and historical works of renowned Turkish and foreign writers. As the publishing house is now defunct, there is little information available about it except its publications. However, in their publications, it can be seen that Reşat Ekrem Koçu prepared a series with the title of *Türkiye Seyahatnameleri* (*Turkey Travel Writings*) which includes translations from Edmondo de Amicis (*Istanbul in 1869*), Théophile Deyrolle (*From Trabzon to Erzurum in 1869*) and Jean de Thévenot (*Istanbul and Turkey in 1655-1656*) besides Elizabeth Craven (*Turkey in 1786*).

The translator, Koçu, was also a historian and folklorist who is well known for his unfinished work *Istanbul Ansiklopedisi* (*Istanbul Encyclopedia*). He studied history and began his career as a research assistant at Istanbul University. He gave history courses at various high schools and also published poems, stories, and historical novels. He also published his writings about Ottoman history in journals and reviews. Since he had a strong passion for research in history, his works about the history of the Ottomans were based on critical research and documents. Koçu desired to popularize history and for this reason, he used a fluent and enthralling style to draw the readers inside the fiction he created by focusing on the daily life of Ottomans, from the Sultan to the children in the streets.

Koçu transcribed Evliya Celebi's travel writings, but he only transcribed the parts he chose and the chapters he thought to be sources for history. He also translated various travel writings. In his translation of Craven, he followed the same translation method as his transcriptions, which meant that he only translated some letters that were related to the Ottoman territories and parts he deemed interesting. In his translator preface of this text, he expresses this:

Elizabeth set out on a long journey over the course of the break up with her first husband. Starting from June 1785 to August 1786, she visited Lyon, Marseille, Geneva, Pisa, Florence, Venice, Vienna, Warsaw, Petersburg, Moscow and Crimea. Later she arrived in Istanbul. From Istanbul, she went to Bulgaria, Walachia, Transylvania and Anspach. She sent travel letters to Prince Frederic throughout these trips. I chose and translated some of these letters that were of interest to our country and entitled the work *Turkey in 1786*. I also added the nature paintings of the Italian painter Cesare Biseo, who came to Istanbul almost a century later than Craven, who had been in Turkey from April to the end of July in 1786 (Craven/ Koçu (Trans.), 1939, p. 7. **translation mine**).

As is inferred from the translator's expressions, the translator behaved selectively in his translation. To be clearer, the chart below shows the letters he chose and how he combined the letters by giving them new titles:

Chart 1: Translated letters of the source text and new chapters in the target text¹	
The Source Text	The Target Text
Letter XLV and Letter XLVI	From Crimea to Istanbul
Letter XLVII, Letter XLVIII and Letter XLIX	Istanbul
Letter L, Letter LI and Letter LII	From Istanbul to Paros Island
Letter LIII, Letter LIV and Letter LV	Athens
Letter LVI, Letter LVII and Letter LVIII	From Greece to Istanbul
Letter LIX and Letter LX	Belgrade Forest
Letter LXI and Letter LXII	From Istanbul to Varna
Letter LXIII	From Varna to Silistra
Letter LXIV and Letter LXV	Walachia

As understood from the chart, the translator chose 21 letters from the source text, which originally included 68 letters, and gave them new titles signaling Craven's travel routes in the Ottoman territories. However, it is also of paramount importance that the translator added 23 pictures from the Italian painter Cesare Biseo's paintings in diverse parts of the text he translated. These pictures both portrayed Turkish people in their daily life and reflected Turkish culture and society in the general sense. To give examples, the target readers come across the pictures of Turkish ships, a dairyman, the Sultan Ahmet Mosque, the Basilica Cistern, a hammam, a Turkish woman in the street, a gypsy, a Circassian odalisque, an Armenian woman, a kind Turkish child, a Zeibek, a street letter-writer and a greengrocer, most of which weren't even mentioned in the source or target text. Furthermore, at the end of the translation, there is one extract from the translator's novel called *Deli Salih (Mad Salih)* along with a note of "an extract for children" and a document from Turkish poet, writer, and publisher Yaşar Nabi Nayır's emphasizing that Koçu was a promising writer that would produce masterworks. In this context, the translator also increases his visibility more through his other identity as an "author" and thus, the addition of such paratextual elements in various chapters reveals his "author-translator" identity (Taş, 2019). Considering all these additions, Bayrı (1939) commented about with these words:

It seems that there are not many parts about Istanbul and Turkey in this translation. In my opinion, the pictures the translator added to his

1 The chart was taken from a previous study which focuses on "an author-translator's translation journey" examining the same source and target text (Taş, 2019).

translation are far more interesting than the work itself. These are the elements that gave meaning and value to this work. (p. 68, **translation mine**)

Moreover, at the end of the book, the publisher leaves an informative note to the readers about the selective approach and other travel writings translated by the translator:

The Orient and Turkey travel writings from foreigners that visited our country in the past centuries occupy a significant place among our historical sources. Reşat Ekrem Koçu produced a book series entitled *Turkey Travel Writings* by translating remarkable parts of these writings for our publishing house. (Craven/Koçu (Trans.), 1939, p. 45, **translation mine**)

Therefore, it can be claimed that such paratextual additions and changes like the translator's reappropriation of the source text were received favorably not only by the target readers but also by the publisher. Thus, rather than the publisher, the translator seems to be the decision-maker regarding all the processes of the translation, including the choice for importing the text, making additions or omissions to it, and even formatting the target text. In other words, the publisher appears to approve the translator's decisions, and thus, through these translations, he adds another series into its book publication range which already had historical, cultural, and literary book series. Therefore, it might be affirmed that the publisher's translation policy conforms to the translator's translation decisions. Furthermore, considering Turkey's historical and political situation, producing such a travel writing series focusing on specific periods of the country's past would appeal to the young republic's nation-building program. However, the translator's selective approach not only was pursued in the book's choice, letters to be translated and in the text's appropriation, but also in the content of the letters and particularly in the translation of the images of Turks, as will be discussed in the following part.

Methodological remarks

Imagology, known as the study of images and representations, lies at the focal point of this study because the source text and target text involve the abundant depiction of images. Imagology is defined as "the study of an intellectual discourse on national characteristics and commonplaces" (Beller & Leerssen, 2007, p. xiii), and is a promising

field taking its roots from literary studies which display the representation of nations or nationalities from a comparative and descriptive perspective. As Manfred Beller (2007) claims, “it is the aim of imagology to describe the origin, process and function of national prejudices and stereotypes, to bring them to the surface, analyse them and make people rationally aware of them” (p. 11-12). In the representation of national images or stereotypes, “the dynamics between those images which characterize the other (hetero-images) and those which characterise one’s own, domestic identity (self-images or auto-images)” help to reveal mental structures (Leerssen, 2007, p. 27). In this context, just as authors who write the source texts, the mediators of the translation process, such as translators, publishers, editors, and reviewers, play important roles as the gatekeepers and representatives of national image building. Such a significant nexus between translation and imagology has been recently emphasized through conferences (“Transferring Cultural Images: Parallels between Stereotyping and Globalising”, Istanbul, Turkey, 2014; *Extranslation in Theory and Practice: Representation of Turkish Culture through Translation*, Ankara, Turkey, 2015; “Images as Translational Fictions”, Guangzhou, China 2017 and “Translating Images of Canada”, Tartu, Estonia, 2019) and publications (Kuran-Burçoğlu, 2000, 2009; Demirkol Ertürk, 2013; van Doorslaer, 2013; van Doorslaer et al., (Eds), 2016; Gheorghiu, 2018; Erkazancı Durmuş, 2021a & 2021b). Among the growing number of publications, a very recent journal issue of the journal of *Translation Spaces* (2021) has even dedicated a special issue to imagology relevant issues and translation practice. Moreover, it tries to build up bridges among translation studies, reception studies, and imagology.

According to van Doorslaer (2019), imagology is descriptive and needs to be considered as “a selection process” which functions through the use of several methodologies (p. 58). As van Doorslaer (2019) explains, “from a methodological point of view, imagological analysis is always an interplay between textual (narratology, discourse analysis), contextual (situatedness of a text, reception history, incl. the importance of paratexts) and intertextual (textual dissemination history) analysis” (p. 58). Given that translation always involves a selection or decision-making process, in the following part, a textual analysis will be applied from an imagological perspective.

Textual analysis from the imagological lens

From an imagological reading, both the source and target text contain a plentitude of images of Turks. However, the “hetero-images” created by the author in the source

text, which can be explained as “Turks” or “the others” from the eyes of an English travel writer, undergo a process of selection in the translation process because such images of the writer are the images of “the self” from the perspective of the translator. Furthermore, most of these images were obscured or only partially rendered by the translator considering their positive/negative implications. Some prominent examples will be provided from the English and Turkish versions of the text in point as follows:

(1)

ST: The Turks in their conduct towards our sex are an example to all other nations. A Turk has his head cut off—his papers are examined—everything in his house seized—but the wife is provided for; her jewels are left her. (Craven, 1789, p. 304)

TT: Kadınlara karşı olan muameleleri bakımından Türkler örnek olmalıdır. Bir adamın başı vuruyor, bütün evrakı, eşyası müsadere ediliyor. Fakat karısı rencide edilmiyor, kadının mücevherlerine el sürülmüyor. **Bir saka, bir hamal karısının bile mücevherleri vardır.** (Craven/Koçu (Trans.), 1939, p. 21, **emphasis mine**)

BT: The Turks in their conduct towards women should be an example. A Turk has his head cut off—his papers are examined—everything in his house seized—but the wife is provided for; her jewels are left her. **Even the wife of a water carrier, or porter has jewelry. (emphasis mine)**

(2)

ST: I wish the Turkish salute was in fashion instead of the ridiculous bow and curtesey we have which indicates nothing, and is seldom executed gracefully. A Turk puts his right-hand upon his heart, and bends forward a little—and I assure you if this kind of salutation is accompanied with a smile or a respectful look, it conveys to me more greeting than all our bonjours and how d’ye do’s, which would be often excused with pleasure by me from half my acquaintance. (Craven, 1789, p. 363-364)

TT: Türklerin selamını bizim reveransımızdan çok manalı buluyorum; ellerini kalplerinin üstüne koyuyorlar ve hafifçe eğiliyorlar. Bu hürmetkar selama bir de tebessüm katılıyor. (Craven/Koçu (Trans.), 1939, p. 33)

BT: I find the Turkish salute more meaningful than our curtsy; they put their hands upon their hearts and bend forward a little. A smile accompanied this respectful salutation.

As shown in the above passages, the Turks are positively stereotyped by the foreign writer within the scope of respect for women, wealth, or the way of saluting. Such positive hetero-images are usually transferred to the target text by the translator either with an addition of a comment which provides an example or evidence of the situation or summarization of the general idea. Moreover, the translator usually abridges the text by trying to give the target readers the gist of the text as also explained in his preface. However, when the Ottomans are mentioned with negative implications as the “barbaric” or “illiterate” people, such images are preserved by the translator in the translation process.

(3)

ST: How the business of the nation goes on at all I cannot guess, for the cabinet is composed generally of **ignorant mercenaries**; [...] Places are obtained at the Porte by intrigue; each placeman, each Sultanness has her creatures, and plots for placing them; and Versailles has not more intricate intrigue than the Porte. (Craven, 1789, p. 272-273)

TT: Osmanlı vükelasına gelince, hep **cahil adamlar**. [...] Entrika burada her mevkie ulaştırıyor. Versailles'de bile bu kadarı yoktur. (Craven/Koçu (Trans.), 1939, p. 11)

BT: When it comes to the Ottoman council of ministers, they are all **ignorant men**. Places are got at the Porte by intrigue. Even in Versailles, there has not been that much intrigue.

As seen above, the translator chooses to preserve the Ottoman imagery which has been regarded for centuries by the West as the “Orient” or the “Other”, although he abridges the text by omitting some words. This selective approach to translating stereotypes with negative implications could be seen as an effort to cut ties with the newly established country's Ottoman past and to build a new national image that is in line with the Young Republic's reformist steps.

Moreover, images of Turks that represent national pictures or stereotypes which attribute negative qualities to Turks such as awkwardness, negligence, ignorance, childishness, illiterateness, guiltiness or despoliation were almost completely omitted from the target text. Several examples illustrate this as follows:

(4)

ST: When I go out, I have the Ambassador's sedan-chair, which is like mine in London, only gilt and varnished like a French coach and six Turks carry it; [...]. Thank Heaven I have but a little way to go in this pomp, and fearing every moment the Turks should fling me down **they are so awkward**; [...]. (Craven, 1789, p. 271)

(5)

ST: I think it a lucky thing for the Ambassadors that the Turks neither pay nor receive visits. —Could anything be so terrible as **the society of the most ignorant and uninformed men upon earth?** (Craven, 1789, p. 276)

(6)

ST: Constantinople is almost surrounded by a very high wall, turreted and flanked by large square towers, built by the Greek Emperors—the style of architecture exactly like that of Warwick and Berkeley Castle; but many of the square towers, which serve as gateways, are mouldering away under **the negligence of the Turks**; [...]. (Craven, 1789, p. 289)

(7)

ST: And it is to be wished by all those who bear any respect to the best monuments of sculpture, that Athens, and all it yet contains, might not by **Mahometan ignorance** be entirely destroyed: at present, ruins, that would adorn a virtuoso's cabinet, are daily burnt into lime by the Turks; and pieces of exquisite workmanship stuck into a wall or fountain. (Craven, 1789, p. 289-290)

(8)

ST: Upon new buildings or children, the Turks imagine the looks of Christians bring ill luck— [...]. All this is very **childish** indeed; but there are a thousand superstitious ideas the Turks have relative to the Franks, which is the name by which they distinguish everyone who wears a European dress. [...]. (Craven, 1789, p. 300-301)

(9)

ST: Among many **absurdities** the Turks are **guilty** of, there is one for which I see no reason. The Sultans formerly built different palaces on the borders of the Canal, which are now forsaken. [...]. (Craven, 1789, p. 302)

(10)

ST: We returned to the Consul's, very much concerned at the **excessive injustice and ignorance of the Turks**, who have really not the smallest idea of the value of the treasures they possess, and destroy them wantonly on every occasion; for, from one of the pillars of the temple of Theseus, [...]. (Craven, 1789, p. 334)

(11)

ST: To-morrow I set out again upon these seas, where at this hour **Turkish ignorance** presents different scenes to those that existed, when the Athenians gave encouragement to heroes and sages. (Craven, 1789, p. 344)

(12)

ST: People imagine this coast to be inhabited by **savage Turks**, who live by **rapine and plunder, uncontrolled** by the Porte; but it is no such thing; Greeks and Armenians, very inoffensive, live-in habitations thinly scattered. (Craven, 1789, p. 375)

The above nine passages that were untranslated clearly show that the writer constructs the hetero-images by making comparisons of nationalities or religions such as the English-Turk, Greek-Turk, Christian-Muslim, Athenian-Turk, Armenian-Turk, or global people. However, negative imagery of Turks built with the "Self" and "Other" oppositions by the writer was mostly not translated by the Turkish translator. The translator seems to use a filter while (re)conveying negative implications about his nationality or "auto-image" and chooses not to render them. In other words, due to his selective approach in translation, negative images of Turks disappear in the target text. The writer's narration mostly involves a pejorative tone, except for a few instances depicting the nature of the country as attractive or full of wonders and the manner of Turks as inventive and respectful. However, in rewriting the target text and omitting negative implications, abridging the text and adding comments or illustrations, the translator's tone becomes commendatory. This rewriting or reconstructing process calls to mind Said's (1978) words on the construction of the Eastern image:

Every work on the Orient ... tries to characterize the place, of course, but what is of greater interest is the extent to which the work's internal structure is in some measure synonymous with a comprehensive interpretation of the Orient. Most of the time, not surprisingly, this interpretation is a form

of Romantic restructuring of the Orient. Every interpretation, every structure created for the Orient, then, is a reinterpretation, a rebuilding of it. (p. 158)

Parallel to Said's perspective, it might arguably be said that the Eastern images were reconstructed by the writer through the use of stereotypes exploited by the West for centuries. However, as every translation is a rewriting and reconstruction, this source text, which includes images of Turks as from the "Orient", underwent another reinterpretation and rebuilding process through translation in which the translator used a selective approach not only at the macro level involving the selection of the source text and its parts for translation and the presentation of the target text but also at micro-level considering the (un) translated images of Turks in the target text. This selective approach might be read as a result of the translator's effort to make the target text acceptable to Turkish readers in the context of the 1930s by rewriting a source text through translation.

Concluding remarks

This study scrutinizes the depiction of images of Turks in the travel writing *A Journey through the Crimea to Constantinople* (1789) written by the English traveler Elizabeth Craven, and traces their repatriation into Turkish through translation entitled *1786'da Türkiye* (1939) by the translator Reşat Ekrem Koçu. The study employs an imagological perspective in its methodology and highlights the nexus between imagology and translation studies. While imagology examines ready-made representations or images which frame the perception of the Other, from the perspective of translation studies, the agents of translation reconstruct or recreate such images in the translation process. Therefore, imagology "inscribes translation as a dynamic force co-constructing differences rather than merely reflecting them" (Flynn, et. al., 2016, p. 5). In this context, the present study tries to shed light on the differences inscribed through images of Turks that were reconstructed in the translation process by applying a comparative textual analysis of the source and target text.

From an imagological point of view, the analysis suggests that the translator created a sense of positive nationhood for the Turks in the target text through some adjustments made in the translation/reconstruction process to make the repatriated text acceptable within its new literary and cultural system. Adjustments include macro-changes such

as the omission of the parts or letters irrelevant to Turkey or long descriptions, as well as the addition of illustrations, prefaces, short extracts from the translator's short stories for children, and the editor's notes on the translation. Moreover, at the micro-level, although Koçu tried to preserve Craven's style, images of Turks were rendered with a selective approach. In other words, while the translator usually exploited traditional or national stereotypes created by the West in terms of the Ottoman images such as "barbaric" or "illiterate" and preserved positive images of Turks praising some behaviors or the wealth of Turks, images with negative implications such as awkwardness, negligence, ignorance, childishness, illiterateness, guiltiness or despoliation were disregarded in the target text. Such translation decisions show that the negative images of Turks, which were often constructed by the foreign writer through the opposition of "Self" and "Other", could not get through the translator's filter. As a result, Turkish readers do not have a complete picture as to how Turks were depicted by others at a specific period of their history.

Furthermore, the choice of the source text for importing into Turkish in the 1930s was the translator's decision, which was highly appreciated by the publisher, as his note on the target text shows. The translator's preferences and his role as an author-translator might have impinged on this choice, as highlighted in another study (Taş, 2019). However, it is paramount to note that the choice for the translation of such travel writing for Turkish readership was not accidental, but rather seems to result from a selective approach suitable for the program of the young republican regime, which aimed at creating an independent Turkish nation with a unique and modern Turkish identity through such publications. Therefore, it might be claimed that the publisher and the translator adopted a translation policy that fit in with the cultural and political agenda of the 1930s, which recaptures translation scholar Toury's words regarding translations as "facts of target culture" (1995, p. 29). In line with Lefevere's (1992) claim that "rewriters adapt, manipulate the originals they work with to some extent" (p. 8), the target text in its repatriation to its own culture was filtered by the translator in order to appeal to a new readership in Turkey with very different social, cultural and political expectations.

In summary, the translator resorts to using existing stereotypes regarding Ottoman or positive Turkish imagery, but applies an omitting strategy when the text involves negative images of Turks. Therefore, it might be suggested that although every text (re)production is a selection process and necessarily involves changes, considering the translation of images or particularly images regarding the translator's nationality and

culture, an additional selection or decision-making process was invoked by the translator in the translation process, in which neither the translator nor the text stayed ideologically neutral because translation is always shaped by its social, economic and cultural context (Lefevere, 1992, p. 1-10). In this context, the translator, as a cultural mediator, appears not to render the images of Turks from a foreign mirror, which mostly includes negative implications. Therefore, the Other's negative views apropos of the Turks could not cross the border in their repatriation to their own culture and nation. Instead, the translator seemed to claim his position as an author-translator in the translation process, and this case particularly illustrated the translator's role as a gatekeeper and the use of translation for selecting and highlighting the representation of mental pictures of a certain culture and period.

Further studies may be conducted to involve the analysis of different text types, such as a corpus from modern media studies or social media platforms, from an imagological approach. Such studies may be fruitful to reveal the identity of the gatekeepers in intercultural transfers, their function in reconveying the national and cultural images, and the ways in which rewritten/reconstructed texts are received by new readerships.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

References

- Basnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (1998). *Constructing cultures: Essays on literary translation*. Multilingual Matters.
- Bayrı, M. H. (1939). Türkiye seyahatnameleri. Yeni eserlere dair düşünceler. *Yeni Türk*, 74, 65-68.
- Beller, M. & Leerssen, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Imagology: the cultural construction and literary representation of national characters: A critical survey*. Rodopi.
- Berk, Ö. (2006). Translating the "West": The position of translated Western literature within the Turkish literary polysystem. *RiLUnE*, 4, 1-18.
- Craven, E. (1789). *A journey through the Crimea to Constantinople in a series of letters from the right honorable Elizabeth Lady Craven, to his serene highness the margrave of Brandebourg, Anspach and Bareith. Written in the Year MDCCLXXXVI*. Chamberlaine, R. Moncrieffe, W. Colles, G. Burnet, W. Wilson [and 7 others in Dublin]. <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/ecco/004838538.0001.000?view=toc>.

- . (1939). *1786'da Türkiye*. (R. E. Koçu, Çev.) Serteller Matbaası, Çığır Kitabevi.
- Demirkol Ertürk, Ş. (2013). Images of Istanbul in translation: A case study in Slovenia. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 4(2), 199-220.
- Erkazancı Durmuş, H. (2021a). Constructing images through the Ottoman translation practices of the late nineteenth century: The case of Ahmet Midhat's *Diplomalı Kız*. In A. Ö. Tarakcıoğlu & E. Ersözlü (Eds.), *Synergy III: Challenges into translation* (pp. 51-66). Peter Lang.
- . (2021b). Ahmet Midhat'ın *Fenni bir roman yahut Amerika doktorları* adlı eserine çeviribilim ve imgebilim ilişkisi bağlamında bir bakış. In Ş. Okyayuz (Ed.), *Çeviri(bilim)de yeni açılımlar* (pp. 83-108). Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Flynn, P., Leerssen, J. & van Doorslaer, L. (2016). On translated images, stereotypes and disciplines. In P. Flynn, J. Leerssen and L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Interconnecting translation studies and imagology* (pp. 1-18). John Benjamins.
- Gentile, P., Kovács, F. & van der Watt, M. (Eds.). (2021). Transnational image building: Linking up translation studies, reception studies and imagology. *Special issue of Translation Spaces*, 10(1). pp.1-4.
- Gheorghio, O.-C. (2018). Imagology and Translation: Rendering the Other's perspective on Romanianness. *Translation studies: Retrospective and prospective views*, 21, 67-79.
- Kuran-Burçoğlu, N. (2000). At the crossroads of translation studies and imagology. In A. Chesterman, N. G. San Salvador & Y. Gambier (Eds.), *Translation in context* (pp. 143-150). John Benjamins.
- . (2007). Turkey. In M. Beller & J. Leerssen (Eds.), *Imagology: The cultural construction and literary representation of national characters: A critical survey* (pp.254-258). Rodopi.
- . (2009). *Reflections on the image of the Turk in Europe*. Isis.
- Laurušaitė, L. (2018). Imagology as image geology. In L. Laurušaitė (Ed.), *Imagology profiles: The dynamics of national imagery in literature* (pp. 8-27). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Leerssen, J. (2007). Imagology: History and method. In M. Beller & J. Leerssen (Eds.), *Imagology: The cultural construction and literary representation of national character: A critical survey* (pp. 17-32). Rodopi.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, rewriting and the manipulation of literary fame*. Routledge.
- Mitsi, E. (2008). Lady Elizabeth Craven's letters from Athens and the female picturesque. In V. Kolocotroni & E. Mitsi (Eds.), *Women writing Greece: Hellenism, orientalism and travel* (19-37). Rodopi.
- Montagu, L. M. W. (1994). *The Turkish embassy letters*. Virago Press.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, Ş. (2008). *The politics and poetics of translation in Turkey, 1923-1960*. Rodopi.
- Taş, S. (2019). Bir yazar-çevirmenin çeviri seyahati. In S. Taş (Ed.), *Çeviri üzerine gözlemler (Observations on translation)* (pp. 57-89). Hiperlink Yayınları.
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- van Doorslaer, L. (2013). Translating, narrating and constructing images in journalism with a test case on representation in Flemish TV news. *Meta*, 57(4), 1046-1059.
- . (2019). Embedding imagology in translation studies (among others). *Slovo.ru: baltijskij accent*, 10(3), 56-68.

- van Doorslaer, L., Flynn, P. & Leerssen, J. (Eds), (2016). *Interconnecting translation studies and imagology*. John Benjamins.
- Winch, A. (2019). If female envy did not spoil everything in the world of women. Lies, rivalry, and reputation in Lady Elizabeth Craven's travelogues. In C. B. Saunders (Ed.), *Women, travel writing, and truth* (pp. 91-108). Routledge.